

I believe that Sinclair Broadcasting's decision to force its stations to air an anti-Kerry documentary days before the election -- and label it as news -- is a clear example of the dangers of media consolidation and possibly a violation of FCC regulations regarding election coverage and advocacy.

Sinclair uses the public airwaves free of charge, and is obligated by law to serve the public interest, and the forced airing of the program in question is not in the public interest. And when media monoliths control the public airways, the corporate interests trump the public interest, and that is antithetical to the original intent of FCC regulation, which were intended to promote a multiplicity of voices, not the consolidation of voices that has resulted. The sham news presented by Sinclair from its "News Central" is nearly worse than no news at all, for Sinclair's viewers may be under the impression that local issues are being covered locally, while those with no coverage would be aware of the void.

Sinclair's actions are one more example -- perhaps the strongest so far -- demonstrating why rules regarding media ownership must be strengthened, not weakened. Those actions also underline the need for the license renewal process to be more than a returned postcard. Thank you.